

REMARKS

Claims 33-61 were pending in this application prior to the Office Action. By this amendment claims 33, 37-39, 47, 51, and 52 are amended, and claims 34, 44, 45, 48, and 59 are cancelled. Support for these amendments can be found, for example, in paragraphs [0068]-[0079] of the application publication. No new matter has been added. Thus, claims 33, 35-43, 46, 47, 49-58, 60, and 61 are now pending. In view of the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 33-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sharma et al. (2002/0068559) in view of Albert et al. (2003/0177389), further in view of Nordstrom et al. (7,136,907). However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Sharma, Albert, or Nordstrom, taken alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention recited in claim 33, 35-43, 46, 47, 49-58, 60, and 61 as presented herein. The remaining rejected claims have been cancelled herein.

For example, independent claim 33 has been amended to clarify the features of the claimed discovery program, including the steps of scanning the network based on a scan profile defining at least one parameter for connecting to at least one of domains, computing nodes, and mobile devices, detecting at least one domain on the network in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile, detecting at least one computing node within the detected domain in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile, and connecting to at least one of the detected computing nodes in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile. In addition, the detecting steps have been amended to specify that the detected mobile devices are either connected to the detected computing node or were previously, but are not currently, connected to the detected computing node. Similar amendments were made to independent system claim 47.

While Sharma discloses the use of a “network discovery function” which browses the network to discover the existing network topology including network “assets,” Applicants

respectfully submit that Sharma fails to disclose or suggest a “network discovery function” that includes the claimed features of *scanning the network based on a scan profile* defining at least one parameter for connecting to at least one of domains, computing nodes, and mobile devices, *detecting at least one domain* on the network in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile, *detecting at least one computing node within the detected domain* in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile, and *connecting to at least one of the detected computing nodes* in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile. In addition, there is no suggestion in Sharma that to detect mobile devices that are either *connected to the detected computing node* or *were previously, but are not currently, connected to the detected computing node*.

For example, Sharma discloses, in paragraph [0021]:

[0021] The system includes a seamless information pipeline connecting management applications running on a mobile wireless capable device, such as a handheld PDA, to a network management server and managed network assets in real-time. The network management server securely connects to the management applications to transmit network events relevant to the configuration and topology of the network. The network management server also employs secure interfaces for receiving events, and real-time connection and configuration data, from the mobile wireless capable device.

While the above disclosure mentions “configuration data,” there is no disclosure whatsoever in Sharma to utilize a “scan profile defining at least one parameter for connecting to at least one of domains, computing nodes, and mobile devices” as recited in the claims. Cited paragraphs [0027] and [0113] also fail to disclose or suggest this feature. Overall, there is no suggestion in Sharma to detect *at least one domain* on the network and *at least one computing node within the detected domain* in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile, and to connect to *at least one of the detected computing nodes* in accordance with the parameters defined in the scan profile.” The “configuration data” of Sharma in no way suggests these types of parameters. Furthermore, *Sharma fails to disclose connecting to a detected computing node*

during the discovery process, which enables the mobile device detection steps. Thus, for at least the above reasons, Sharma fails to disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention set forth in claims 33 and 47.

Albert and Nordstrom fail to overcome the above stated deficiencies of Sharma, including, for example, the use of a discovery program having the claimed features, and detecting mobile devices that are either connected to the detected computing node or were previously, but are not currently, connected to the detected computing node. To the contrary, Albert merely discloses, in paragraph [0024], a system for regulating access at a computing system or devices as required for connection of a device to a network. In addition, Nordstrom discloses, a discovery utility that allows an operating system of a distributed computer system, such as a system area network, to be notified whenever a new component is added to the network. There is no suggestion whatsoever in Albert or Nordstrom to utilize a discovery program as claimed, or to detect mobile devices associated with a detected computing node. Accordingly, neither Albert's nor Nordstrom's teachings do remedy at least the above-stated deficiencies of Sharma.

In contrast to the above teachings, the present claims relate to the use of a discovery program that 1) detects mobile devices on the network that are connected to a computing node, and 2) detects mobile devices on the network that were previously, but are not currently, connected to the computing node. The features of the claimed discovery program are described in paragraphs [0067]-[0076] of the published application, which described the claimed scan profile as well as the other characteristics of the discovery program, and the detection of mobile devices that are associated with the detected computing node.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, neither Albert nor Sharma nor Nordstrom, alone or in combination, disclose, suggest, or render obvious the invention recited in pending claims 33, 35-43, 46, 47, 49-58, 60, and 61. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY, LLP

Date: July 9, 2009

/Stephen M. Hertzler, Reg. No. 58,247/
Stephen M. Hertzler
Reg. No. 58,247

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Customer No. 22204
401 9th Street, N.W., Suite 900
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 585-8000